UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,872	02/15/2001	Sandy Parish	NAI1P138/00.152.01	4557

28875 7590 05/21/2004

SILICON VALLEY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 721120
SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120

EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL, JAMES H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/784,872	PARISH, SANDY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 February 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 10-15, 16-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (U.S. Patent No. 6,623,529).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 13, 16, and 18), Lakritz teaches that he parser first reads the HTML document and parses it into the intermediate format used by the invention. The default rule and the external rules are applied while parsing and text segments are marked as either translatable or non-translatable. Translatable segments are presented to one or more language databases to obtain their translations. Finally, the HTML generator is invoked to serve the localized HTML stream to the browser. There are cases where text between tags is not necessarily translatable. For example, if the HTML includes embedded script (e.g., JavaScript or Cold Fusion) only some of the text may need to be translated (e.g., quoted strings). In addition, these scripts are often wrapped in comments so browsers will not display the literal code, but the parser identifies the text (Col. 7, lines 41-54; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 13, 16, and 18), ***"... reading a computer file containing HTML tags and scripts; identifying character strings located between the HTML tags and within the scripts; generating a modified version of the***

computer file by replacing the identified character strings with variables"). Lakritz also teaches With respect to Figs. 4 and 5, the toolkit (402) also features a novel mechanism to create localized content for specific geographic regions or countries by using a template-based approach to dynamically create documents tailored for a specific language or country. This feature makes it easy to create a true global site localized for each area of the world with the smallest achievable site footprint on the Web server (503). A template contains placeholders for country and language-specific information that has been removed from a document. This information is dynamically inserted from a TermDB (508) (an external glossary), another template or document located in a database or file system (509), or provided automatically by the Developer module (502) when the composite document is presented to the browser (501) (Col. 6, lines 50-64). The template taught by Lakritz contains *country and language-specific information that has been removed from a document* suggesting that items in the original computer file that vary with country or language are stored separately from the modified version of the computer file. Compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 13, 16, and 18), ***"...generating an include file containing the variables and associated character strings; and adding a reference to the include file in the modified version of the computer file"***. Thus, while Lakritz does not explicitly teach *generating an include file* and *adding a reference to the include file in the modified version of the computer file*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that one way to recombine the part of the computer file that is country/language dependent in a modified computer file would have been to reference it

as an "include file" in the modified computer file providing the benefit of modifying only country/language-specific content when a change in such information is requested.

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly dependent Claims 15, 17, and 19), Lakritz does not specifically teach *translating the character strings of the include file to a language different than that of the character strings in the original computer file*. However, Lakritz does teach translating strings found between HTML tags and in scripts that are so marked (Col. 7, lines 37-40; compare to Claim 2 (and similarly Claims 15, 17, and 19), ***"... translating the character strings of the include file to a language different than that of the character strings in the original computer file"***). Thus, while Lakritz does not explicitly teach *translating the character strings of the include file*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have translated character strings in the include file because whether or not the character strings exist in the same file as the original, or in a separate file, the outcome is the same; namely the final result is a translated file that is displayed to the user.

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly dependent Claims 12, and 20), Lakritz teaches that the invention provides special tags that are used to insert language or country-specific content into an HTML document. The tags are: Multi-country server-side includes (MCSSI); and Multi-language server-side includes (MLSSI). MCSSI allows locale-specific elements of an HTML document to be dynamically included as a function of the current region or country, while MLSSI allows localized elements of an HTML document to be included as a function of the current language (Col. 5, lines 41-49;

compare to Claim 3 (and similarly Claims 12, and 20), ***"... adding a reference to the include file comprises adding a reference to the translated include file"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly dependent Claims 10, 22, and 26), Lakritz does not specifically teach that *the computer file is an ASP file or a VBScript file*. However, Lakritz does teach a computer file that can contain HTML and scripting (Col. 7, lines 49-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have specifically substituted an ASP file or a VBScript file for the claimed computer file providing the benefit of dynamically affecting the content of the computer file.

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Lakritz teaches an automatic determination of the language and country of a Web site visitor and a directing of the Web server to deliver the appropriate localized content contained in a country/language database to the visitor's browser (see Abstract; compare to Claim 11, ***"... storing the modified version of the computer file and the include file in a Web server connected to the Internet"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Lakritz does not specifically teach *the computer readable medium is selected from the group comprising of CD-ROM, zip disk, floppy disk, tape, flash memory, system memory, hard drive, and data signal embodied in a carrier wave*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to store the claimed computer code on a storage device providing the benefit of reuse of the computer code.

In regard to dependent Claim 21 (and similarly dependent Claim 23), Lakritz teaches a computer file that can contain HTML and scripting (Col. 7, lines 49-54; compare to Claim 21, ***"... the computer file is an HTML file containing HTML tags"*** and Claim 23, ***"... the computer file contains scripts"***).

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz.

In regard to dependent Claim 25, Lakritz teaches that the invention provides special tags that are used to insert language or country-specific content into an HTML document. The tags are: Multi-country server-side includes (MCSSI); and Multi-language server-side includes (MLSSI). MCSSI allows locale-specific elements of an HTML document to be dynamically included as a function of the current region or country, while MLSSI allows localized elements of an HTML document to be included as a function of the current language (Col. 5, lines 41-49; compare to Claim 25, ***"... generating a reference file comprises generating a server side include file"***).

Claims 5-9, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz in view of Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky, U.S. Patent No. 6,665,642).

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Lakritz fails to teach *temporarily replacing comments, scripts, and HTML tags of the computer file with tokens*. However, Kanevsky teaches that the Initial HTML Parsing Module (405) parses out from the HTML the locations of the resources, like the graphic, and downloads those resources. This function is in addition to the general initial parsing of the HTML, when the Initial

HTML Parsing Module takes the elements of the web page, as indicated by the web page such as text, fonts, relative positions, etc. and translates them into tokens. These tokens can be used by the other modules in the Universal Translator/Mediator Server, as will be described below. As indicated in step (337) in Fig. 4, the results of the initial parsing, the tokens and downloaded resources, are all stored in a single cache file of the Master Input Cache (415) (Col. 10, lines 44-59; compare to Claim 5, ***"... temporarily replacing comments, scripts, and HTML tags of the computer file with tokens"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Lakritz and Kanevsky providing the benefit of enabling the reformatting of an HTML page in a manner appropriate to a particular special need.

In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly dependent Claim 24), Lakritz teaches if the HTML includes embedded script (e.g., JavaScript or Cold Fusion) only some of the text may need to be translated (e.g., quoted strings). In addition, these scripts are often wrapped in comments so browsers will not display the literal code, but the parser identifies the text (Col. 7, lines 50-55; compare to Claim 6 (and similarly Claim 24), ***"... parsing the scripts"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Lakritz fails to specifically teach *replacing the tokens with the corresponding comments, scripts, and HTML tags after the scripts are parsed.* However, Kanevsky teaches that the Initial HTML Parsing Module (405) is that it translates the regular web page into unformatted raw data, which is stored in a file in the Master Input Cache (415). This cached unformatted raw data is input, under the

direction of the Master Formatting Client (410), into the other modules of the Universal Translator/Mediator Server. The other modules reformat the raw data in a manner appropriate to a particular special need, and the combined results of the reformatting are put together as a reformatted web page, which is cached in Master Output Cache (495) and transmitted to the user's web browser. An overview of this flow of data, in the form of a block diagram, is shown in Fig. 6 (Col 10, lines 60-67; Col. 11, lines 1-5; compare to Claim 7, ***"... replacing the tokens with the corresponding comments, scripts, and HTML tags after the scripts are parsed"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Lakritz and Kanevsky providing the benefit of enabling the reformatting of an HTML page in a manner appropriate to a particular special need.

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Lakritz teaches that there are cases where text between tags is not necessarily translatable. For example, if the HTML includes embedded script (e.g., JavaScript or Cold Fusion) only some of the text may need to be translated (e.g., quoted strings). In addition, these scripts are often wrapped in comments so browsers will not display the literal code, but the parser identifies the text (Col. 7, lines 48-55; compare to Claim 8, ***"... parsing the scripts comprises identifying HTML tags and text strings located within the scripts"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Lakritz fails to teach *replacing the HTML tags with tokens*. However, Kanevsky teaches that the Initial HTML Parsing Module (405) is that it translates the regular web page into unformatted raw data, which is stored in a file in the Master Input Cache (415). This cached unformatted raw data is input, under the

direction of the Master Formatting Client (410), into the other modules of the Universal Translator/Mediator Server. The other modules reformat the raw data in a manner appropriate to a particular special need, and the combined results of the reformatting are put together as a reformatted web page, which is cached in Master Output Cache (495) and transmitted to the user's web browser. An overview of this flow of data, in the form of a block diagram, is shown in Fig. 6 (Col 10, lines 60-67; Col. 11, lines 1-5; compare to Claim 9, ***"... replacing the HTML tags with tokens"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Lakritz and Kanevsky providing the benefit of enabling the reformatting of an HTML page in a manner appropriate to a particular special need.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
05/11/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER